UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/563,495	01/04/2006	Malcolm David Macleod	05-1094	8270
	7590 03/28/200 BOEHNEN HULBER	EXAMINER		
300 S. WACKER DRIVE			NGUYEN, NGA X	
	32ND FLOOR CHICAGO, IL 60606		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3662	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/28/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/563,495	MACLEOD, MALCOLM DAVID			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	NGA X. NGUYEN	3662			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 December 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrav 5) ☐ Claim(s) 9,18 and 19 is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-8,11-17 and 20 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.				
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.				
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 04 January 2006 is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the ore Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oregin of of t	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). lected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/28/2006.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	nte			

Application/Control Number: 10/563,495 Page 2

Art Unit: 3662

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claim 1-8, 11-17 & 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyoshi (6281840) in view of Margerum (4481519). With regard to claim 1, 10 & 20, Prater discloses:

- A plurality of antennas (see column 3, lines 20-23).
- Determining individual antenna signal strengths (see 3, lines 62-65)
- Determining at least one emitter bearing from antenna signal strengths (see column 3-4, lines 66-8).

Margerum discloses:

 Combining for deriving combined antenna signal strengths by forming combinations of 1st and 2nd antenna signals are in two sets with signals in one set having a non-zero phase difference relative to signals the other set (see column 2-4, lines 54-63).

It would have been obvious to modify Miyoshi by incorporating the teaching of Margerum's combination to combine antennas' signals so as the system is enable to determine an emitter bearing.

With regard to claim 2-3 & 11-12, Miyoshi teaches determining emitter bearing is arranged to derive covariance matrix elements from antenna signal strengths and a

relationship between antenna signal strengths and emitter bearing (see column 5, lines 23-41).

With regard to claim 4-5 & 13-14, Margerum teaches the relative phase difference is in the range 30-120 degrees, and substantially 90 degrees (see column 3, lines 12-24). With regard to claim 6 & 15, Margerum teaches combining antenna signals with equal gain magnitude and with or without equal phase (see column 3, lines 17-39). With regard to claim 7 & 17, Margerum teaches that the combining incorporates phase shifting switch-able into and out of an antenna signal path (see column 4, lines 6-38). With regard to claim 8, Margerum teaches that the combining incorporates an adder having two inputs both switch-ably connected to individual signal paths extending to respective antennas (see column 6, lines 45-51).

Allowable Subject Matter

2. Claim 9 & 18-19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 12/19/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to claim 1-20, applicant argues that the prior arts failed to teach the claims' limitations.

Response: The application's arguments are moot in view of the new grounds of the rejection.

Art Unit: 3662

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NGA X. NGUYEN whose telephone number is (571)272-5217. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, TARCZA H. THOMAS can be reached on (571) 272-6979. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

NGA X NGUYEN Examiner Art Unit 3662

NXN

/Thomas H. Tarcza/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3662

Application/Control Number: 10/563,495

Page 5

Art Unit: 3662